

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/722,717	11/26/2003	John D. Colleran	4060	7338
759	90 11/20/2006		EXAM	INER
Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC			AHLUWALIA, NAVNEET K	
Suite 193 704-228th Avenue NE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Sammamish, WA 98074			2166	
			DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· .	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/722,717	COLLERAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
,	Navneet K. Ahluwalia	2166				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 S						
,	·—					
,	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/722,717 Page 2

Art Unit: 2166

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed September 12, 2006.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Claims 1 21 are pending in this Office Action. After a further search and a thorough examination of the present application, claims 1 21 remain rejected. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to claim 10 is withdrawn in view of the amendment. The objection to claim 10 in view of the amendment is withdrawn.
- 3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2166

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parthesarathy et al. ('Parthesarathy' herein after) (US 6,353,926 B1) further in view of Eric Ustaris ('Ustaris' herein after) (US 2004/0060035 A1).

With respect to claim 1,

Parthesarathy discloses in a computing environment, a method comprising: providing a selected manifest chosen from among a plurality of manifests based upon a detected type of computer-related problem, the selected manifest identifying a set of at least one tool that when executed collects data for analysis with respect to diagnosing the computer-related problem (column 6 lines 32 – 42, Parthesarathy); providing a control mechanism to interpret the selected manifest, the control mechanism automatically executing each tool identified in the set to collect the data from a machine (column 5 lines 61 – 67, Parthesarathy); and receiving the data collected from the machine (column 6 lines 48 – 58, Parthesarathy).

Parthesarathy however does not explicitly disclose the plurality of manifests out of which one is selected.

Ustaris teaches the plurality of manifests and also teaches the selecting of a manifest based on the problem or requirement (paragraphs 0020 – 0021 and 0037 – 0038, Ustaris).

Art Unit: 2166

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because Ustaris's method provides an automated building of a software application based upon the submissions from programmers and furthermore provides an automated deployment/installation method for taking an updated or revised version to their systems (paragraphs 0018 and 0020 – 0021, Ustaris). Furthermore, with the plurality of manifests being built and modified according to the requirements/problems enhances the deployment with ease (paragraphs 0037 – 0038, Ustaris)

Claims 2 – 9 are rejected under the same rationale given for claim 1. The citations of the elements claimed and taught are listed below.

With respect to claim 2,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein providing the selected manifest comprises providing a mechanism that when clicked on links to the selected manifest (column 7 lines 22 – 30, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 3,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 2 wherein providing the mechanism comprises providing a URL that when clicked on links to the selected manifest (column 7 lines 34 – 47, Parthesarathy).

Art Unit: 2166

With respect to claim 4,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein providing the selected manifest comprises sending information about the selected manifest in an email message (column 10 lines 1 – 3, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 5,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein providing the selected manifest comprises sending information about the selected manifest in an instant message (column 9 lines 2 – 12, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 6,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein providing the selected manifest comprises providing a site that may be accessed via a browser (column 8 lines 66 – 67 and column 9 lines 1 – 5, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 7,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein for each tool, the control mechanism determines whether that tool needs to be downloaded and installed to the machine, and if so, the control mechanism further downloading and installing that tool (column 6 lines 48 – 58, Parthesarathy).

Art Unit: 2166

With respect to claim 8,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising, running a reporting program to collect the data and package the data for transmission (column 6 lines 13 – 26, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 9,

Parthesarathy discloses the method of claim 1 wherein providing the control mechanism comprises transmitting the control mechanism to the machine (column 9 lines 25 – 33, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 10,

Parthesarathy discloses a tangible computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions which when executed performs steps, comprising: providing a selected manifest chosen from among a plurality of manifests based upon a detected type of computer-related problem (column 6 lines 32 – 42, Parthesarathy), the selected manifest identifying a set of at least one tool that when executed collects data for analysis with respect to diagnosing the computer-related problem providing a control mechanism to interpret the selected manifest, the control mechanism automatically executing each tool identified in the set to collect the data from a machine (column 5 lines 61 – 67, Parthesarathy); and receiving the data collected from the machine. (column 6 lines 48 – 58, Parthesarathy).

Art Unit: 2166

Parthesarathy however does not explicitly disclose the plurality of manifests out of which one is selected.

Ustaris teaches the plurality of manifests and also teaches the selecting of a manifest based on the problem or requirement (paragraphs 0020 – 0021 and 0037 – 0038, Ustaris).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because Ustaris's method provides an automated building of a software application based upon the submissions from programmers and furthermore provides an automated deployment/installation method for taking an updated or revised version to their systems (paragraphs 0018 and 0020 – 0021, Ustaris). Furthermore, with the plurality of manifests being built and modified according to the requirements/problems enhances the deployment with ease (paragraphs 0037 – 0038, Ustaris)

With respect to claim 11,

Parthesarathy discloses in a computing environment, a system comprising: a set of available tools, the tools configured to collect data from a machine with respect to diagnosing computer-related problems; (column 6 lines 32 – 42, Parthesarathy); a reporting mechanism that provides access to data collected from the machine (column 6 lines 48 – 58, Parthesarathy); and a control mechanism that is communicated to or is otherwise operable on the machine, the control mechanism configured to execute a subset of the tools to collect data, in which the subset of tools was selected based on a

Art Unit: 2166

particular type of detected computer-related problem and the control mechanism further configured to operate the reporting mechanism to allow analysis of the collected data (column 5 lines 61 – 67, Parthesarathy).

Parthesarathy however does not explicitly disclose the plurality of manifests out of which one is selected.

Ustaris teaches the plurality of manifests and also teaches the selecting of a manifest based on the problem or requirement (paragraphs 0020 – 0021 and 0037 – 0038, Ustaris).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because Ustaris's method provides an automated building of a software application based upon the submissions from programmers and furthermore provides an automated deployment/installation method for taking an updated or revised version to their systems (paragraphs 0018 and 0020 – 0021, Ustaris). Furthermore, with the plurality of manifests being built and modified according to the requirements/problems enhances the deployment with ease (paragraphs 0037 – 0038, Ustaris)

Claims 12 – 21 are rejected under the same rationale given for claim 11. The citations of the elements claimed and taught are listed below.

With respect to claim 12,

Art Unit: 2166

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the set of available tools is maintained in a program store associated with a software support entity (column 6 lines 32 – 37, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 13,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the control mechanism executes the subset of tools by interpreting a manifest that identifies the subset of tools and was selected based upon the particular type of computer-related problem (column 6 lines 48 – 59, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 14,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 13 wherein the manifest comprises a data file accessed via a URL (column 7 lines 22 – 30, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 15,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 13 further comprising a mechanism that selects the manifest from among a set of manifests, the selection based on received user data.

With respect to claim 16,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 14 wherein the control mechanism is communicated to the machine in response to accessing the URL (column 7 lines 34 –

Application/Control Number: 10/722,717 Page 10

Art Unit: 2166

47, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 17,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the control mechanism downloads to the machine at least one of the tools in the subset (column 9 lines 25 – 33, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 18,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the control mechanism installs at least one of the tools in the subset on the machine (column 48 – 58, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 19,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the control mechanism compares a version of an existing tool on the machine with a version of a tool in the subset (Figure 3, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 20,

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 11 wherein the control mechanism operates in response to a received user request (column 6 lines 1 – 10, Parthesarathy).

With respect to claim 21,

Page 11

Application/Control Number: 10/722,717

Art Unit: 2166

Parthesarathy discloses the system of claim 20 wherein the control mechanism executes at least one of the tools in the subset that was already installed on the machine prior to receiving the user request (column 6 lines 48 – 58 and column 9 lines 25 – 33, Parthesarathy).

Application/Control Number: 10/722,717 Page 12

Art Unit: 2166

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2166

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Navneet K. Ahluwalia whose telephone number is 571-

272-5636. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alam T. Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mr 11/16/06.

Nowneet

Navneet K. Ahluwalia

Examiner

Art Unit 2166

Dated: 11/15/2006